

Final Program Evaluation

Improving & Expanding Access to Primary Education for Deaf/Hard of Hearing Children in Tanzania

Implementation Partners

Global Deaf Connection
USAID

Evaluation Team

Shawn Boonstra
Dennis Duffy
Zoe Hartzell
Bior Keech
Peter Polga-Hecimovich
Humphrey School of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

May 2015

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
Definition of Terms	3
Executive Summary	5
Section 1: Country Background.....	7
Section 2: Development Problem	8
Section 3: Program Overview	10
Section 4: Evaluation Outline	14
Section 5: Evaluation Methods	15
Section 6: Findings.....	17
Section 7: Recommendations	26
Section 8: Conclusion	29
Appendix A: Interview Questions	30
Appendix B: Grant Proposals	39

Acknowledgements

The authors of this evaluation report would like to acknowledge the many people that made this work possible. Our sincere thanks go to Global Deaf Connection for giving us the opportunity to evaluate the Tanzania program. Joel Runnels and Robin Donkersgoed were instrumental in facilitating our communication with several stakeholders in Tanzania, and we thank them for always being available and answering our numerous questions. The team would like to thank the interviewees for their input, including the students, the participants of the GDC program, and the government representatives from the Tanzania Ministry of Education, Special Education Unit in Zanzibar, CHAVITA, CHAVIZA, the Dodoma Deaf School, and USAID. Our sincere thanks go to Mjimwema and Mwanakwerekwe primary schools teachers, administrators, and students for giving us the opportunity to tour their schools.

The team would like to thank Professor Christopher Johnstone, Mr. Brian Foster, and our many colleagues for their advice during this report. We also greatly appreciate our advisor, Dr. Sherry Gray, for arranging this incredible opportunity and for providing guidance and support throughout the school year. Her counsel and assistance has benefited us enormously and we are very thankful for the work that she does.

Definition of Terms

This section of the report will define some abbreviations and terms that appear frequently in the remainder of the report.

CHAVITA: Tanzania Association of the Deaf, a non-governmental organization that works to advance the human rights of Deaf Tanzanians through six program areas: advocacy, poverty reduction, sign language development, women and gender development, membership and public relations, and social welfare. CHAVITA collaborated with Global Deaf Connection in certain aspects of the program under evaluation.

CHAVIZA: CHAVITA's branch on the island of Zanzibar.

D/HH: deaf and hard-of-hearing. The Evaluation Team considered it important to use clear and respectful language to refer to the intended beneficiaries of this program, but it did not find a perfect consensus among other written works on the subject. Some academic sources capitalize the word deaf ("Deaf") when referring to people who identify themselves as part of a deaf culture, and use the lower-case word for anyone with the physiological condition of deafness. This report follows that convention, where the abbreviation D/HH refers to anyone with a hearing impairment, not just those who consider themselves members of a distinct culture on that basis. The only exceptions are in quoted or excerpted material, such as quotes from the interviews or excerpts from Global Deaf Connection's grant proposals, where the original terminology was left unchanged.

deaf school: a primary school that educates deaf and hard-of-hearing students exclusively

deaf unit: a section for the deaf and hard-of-hearing at a primary school that mainly educates hearing students

the evaluation team or the team: Shawn Boonstra, Dennis Duffy, Zoe Hartzell, Bior Keech, and Peter Polga-Hecimovich; the graduate students who conducted this evaluation and prepared this report.

GDC: Global Deaf Connection, an international non-governmental organization that implemented the program under evaluation as well as similar programs in Jamaica, Kenya, and Uganda. Its mission is "to develop self-sustaining cycles of Deaf education and leadership skills through advocacy, multi-cultural exchange, college scholarships, and mentor support. These cycles will empower Deaf people in developing countries to achieve greater access to universal human rights which will increase their social and economic self sufficiency."¹

¹ "Welcome." Global Deaf Connection. As of May 3, 2015: [http:// www.globaldeafconnection.org](http://www.globaldeafconnection.org)

graduate: a deaf or hard-of-hearing person who *completed* teacher training at Mtwara Teacher Training College or Zanzibar Islamic Academy under Global Deaf Connection's auspices.

IEA: *Improving & Expanding Access to Primary Education for Deaf/Hard of Hearing children in Tanzania*, the name of the program under evaluation, as it appears in Global Deaf Connection's realigned proposal to USAID in 2014. Sometimes it is also referred to as "GDC's program in Tanzania." It had a different name in the original grant proposal of 2010: *Improving and Expanding Early Primary School Education for Learners with Hearing Impairments in Zanzibar and Mtwara Regions of Tanzania*.

Ministry of Education or MoE: the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training of the United Republic of Tanzania. Unless otherwise specified, also refers to the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar's ministry of the same name.

MTTC: Mtwara Teacher Training College, one of two institutions where deaf and hard-of-hearing participants received training with Global Deaf Connection's support. (It is not owned or operated by Global Deaf Connection, but served as a venue for an important part of the program under evaluation.)

participant: a deaf or hard-of-hearing person who received (or is receiving) teacher training in Mtwara or Zanzibar under Global Deaf Connection's auspices.

student: unless otherwise specified, a *primary school* student (as opposed to a person receiving teacher training; see "participant").

TSL: Tanzanian Sign Language

USAID: the United States Agency for International Development, the primary funding source for the program under evaluation.

Zanzibar Islamic Academy: one of two institutions where program participants received training with Global Deaf Connection's support. (It is not owned or operated by Global Deaf Connection, but served as a venue for an important part of the program under evaluation.)

ZSL: Zanzibar Sign Language

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of a final external evaluation of the *Improving & Expanding Access to Primary Education for Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing Children in Tanzania* program (IEA). USAID requires external evaluations of all of its projects and Global Deaf Connection (GDC) commissioned a group of five graduate students at the Humphrey School of Public Affairs to conduct the evaluation.

The purpose of this evaluation is to examine the strengths and weaknesses of IEA and compile the lessons learned after the five-year implementation of this project. IEA was restructured halfway through its implementation, and the goals of the program changed considerably. The objectives of the realigned grant are:

- Provide approximately 400 D/HH students with an inclusive education from program graduates
- Facilitate a sensitization on simple signs and best practice inclusion with 10 MTTC lecturers, one Tanzanian Sign Language (TSL) interpreter, and two administrators, and a sensitization on optimal collaboration with TSL interpreters
- Facilitate a more general sensitization for as many as 20 USAID and US Embassy Tanzania personnel
- Sensitize workplaces where program graduates work so co-workers have a general understanding of inclusion best practices
- Produce a video of program participant success stories
- Provide program participants with professional mentors

This report's findings and recommendations focus primarily on the realigned grant and represent the best practices that GDC should consider as they implement projects in the future.

The evaluation team conducted multiple interviews with stakeholders in Tanzania in March 2015. The team also reviewed program documents and visited several D/HH classrooms. The team designed all interview questions to answer the following evaluation questions:

1. What were the strengths of the program?
2. What were the weaknesses of the program?
3. Is the program in Tanzania sustainable?
4. To what degree was the program beneficial?
5. To what degree was MTTC accessible to program participants?
6. In what ways were program participants supported?
7. How have D/HH students benefited from having D/HH teachers and role models?
8. What are the factors that GDC would need to consider to replicate the project?

The in-country data collection produced the following key findings:

1. Participants in the IEA program appreciated the opportunity to further their education and their career.
2. Stakeholders reported consistent weakness in communication with GDC and felt marginalized as a result.
3. The lack of a comprehensive feasibility study prior to implementation led GDC to set unrealistic initial goals, and the failure to meet those goals hurt GDC's image in Tanzania.
4. There were mixed reports of support for program participants, with some participants reporting satisfaction with the monetary and person support from GDC while other participants reporting that support was inadequate.
5. None of the objectives from the realigned grant had been met at the time of data collection.
6. The lack of stakeholder support for the program and the difficulties that the program has had over the last five years indicate that the project is not sustainable.

The report makes the following recommendations. These recommendations indicate the best practices and suggestions that stakeholders indicated would ensure future program success:

1. Implement a thorough feasibility study with more emphasis on the input of local stakeholders prior to writing the project proposal.
2. Identify program participants prior to implementing the project to ensure the project is viable and to prevent setting unrealistic expectations for program success.
3. Create a communication plan to ensure that key stakeholders receive regular updates about program progress and challenges.
4. Organize in-country management structure to ensure project milestones are met and stakeholders are engaged throughout the implementation of the program.
5. Revise program structure to improve candidate recruitment and placement.

Section 1: Country Background

Tanzania is located in East Africa and borders the Indian Ocean and eight other countries. After gaining independence from Britain in the early 1960s, the modern United Republic of Tanzania was formed as a union between the mainland, then known as Tanganyika, and the coastal island of Zanzibar in 1964. Under the union agreement, the Zanzibar Government maintains considerable local autonomy with its own president and legislature. Tanzania is ethnically and religiously diverse, with over 125 ethnic groups, and Christianity and Islam are the dominant religions.² Its political capital is Dodoma, while Dar es Salaam is the main commercial center for the country's population of nearly 50 million. The current President, Jakaya Kikwete, is the fourth since independence and has maintained Tanzania's peace and stability in a region where civil and religious wars are common.³ The World Bank has classified Tanzania as a low-income country with an annual gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate of seven percent in 2013.⁴

Education

The Tanzanian government considers education an integral part of its social and economic development. This has led to the creation of strong policies and structural reforms and helped ensure universal primary education. As the Ministry of Education summarizes in its mission statement, the government of Tanzania is committed to education policies that "provide equal opportunity to quality education for all Tanzanians and ensure development of a productive quality human resource base through education and training."⁵

Kiswahili is the language of instruction in primary schools, and English in secondary schools and other institutions of higher learning.⁶ The Tanzanian education system is based on the 2-7-4-2-3 system. This means children begin with two years of pre-primary school followed by seven years of primary school. Secondary school is divided into two cycles: a four-year cycle leading to the ordinary-level examinations and a two-year cycle leading to the advanced-level examinations. The Tanzanian government made primary school free of charge in 2012 as well as secondary school for those who pass the national exams. While this move has helped lead the way for a near doubling of the primary enrollment nationwide, national funding for education has not kept pace.

² "Tanzania," The World Factbook. As of April 30, 2015: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tz.html>

³ Ted Dagne, "Tanzania: Background and Current Conditions," Congressional Research Service, 2011.

⁴ "Tanzania," The World Bank. As of April 30, 2015: <http://data.worldbank.org/country/tanzania>

⁵ "Introduction to MoEVT," Ministry of Education and Vocational Training, United Republic of Tanzania. As of April 30, 2015: http://www.moe.go.tz/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1577&Itemid=629

⁶ All facts in this paragraph are from "United Republic of Tanzania," World Data on Education, UNESCO-IBE, 7th Edition. As of April 30, 2015: http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdfversions/United_Republic_of_Tanzania.pdf

Section 2: Development Problem

In the 19th century the continent had only a smattering of educational opportunities for the deaf and hard-of-hearing, and these were often missionary schools in the European educational tradition. It has only been in the last few decades that local efforts to educate the deaf and hard-of-hearing in large numbers have sprung up. However, reliable data on the education of the deaf and hard-of-hearing in the continent, much less East Africa or Tanzania, are not available. While the wide range of cultures and languages within East Africa makes it difficult to create standard curriculums, recent calls for a stronger effort in deaf education have grown louder.

D/HH children and adults tend to be poorer than those with normal hearing and face limited job prospects. They are more likely to be sexually abused and less likely to report sexual or physical abuse. They are less likely than the general population to receive sexual education and are thus more likely to get sexually transmitted diseases or other communicable diseases.⁷

Despite strides forward in Tanzania's education model for children with disabilities, it was estimated in 2006 that only three percent of these children receive even basic education in the country.⁸ It is further estimated that 50 to 66 percent of hearing impairment in the developing world is due to preventable causes such as disease and inadequate prenatal care.⁹ Since developing countries have higher rates of these causes, they also have higher rates of hearing impairment. Between 1.4 and 4 of every 1,000 people in the developing world are thought to have a hearing impairment, compared to one in 1,000 in the developed world.¹⁰ Applying these rates to Tanzania's total population of almost 50 million suggests the D/HH population is probably between 69,000 and 197,000, of whom 35,400 to 101,000 are under the age of 18. The World Health Organization estimates that boys are more apt to suffer from hearing loss than girls, by a ratio of 56 to 44.¹¹ Further, Tanzania has an annual population growth rate of almost three percent, and more than half of its population is under the age of 18.¹²

Although local dialects have led to minor discontinuities within the country and a single, standardized sign language has not yet been codified, the trend of the language is

⁷ Kiyaga, Nassozi B., and Donald F. Moores. "Deafness in Sub-Saharan Africa." *American Annals of the Deaf* 148.1 (2003): 18-24.

⁸ United Republic of Tanzania. Vienna: UNESCO, 2006. United Republic of Tanzania: Principles and General Objectives of Education. UNESCO, Sept. 2006. Web. http://www.ibe.unesco.org/Countries/WDE/2006/SUB-SAHARAN_AFRICA/United_Republic_of_Tanzania/United_Republic_of_Tanzania.pdf

⁹ Smith, Andrew, and Hatcher, Juanita. Preventing Deafness in Africa's Children. *African Health*. 1992;15(1):33-35.

¹⁰ Feachem, Richard G., and Dean T. Jamison. *Disease and Mortality in Sub-Saharan Africa*. New York: Published for the World Bank Oxford UP, 2006. Print.

¹¹ Million Live with Hearing Loss. Publication. WHO, Apr. 2013. <http://www.who.int/pbd/deafness/news/Millionslivewithhearingloss.pdf>

¹² "Statistics on United Republic of Tanzania." UNICEF, 31 Dec. 2013. http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/tanzania_statistics.html

toward standardization and unification.¹³ The country also has yet to achieve a unified education model for the deaf and hard-of-hearing; while there are a handful of privately-funded primary schools devoted solely to the deaf and hard-of-hearing, most families with D/HH children do not have the resources to enroll them in these schools. Public and private schools around the country otherwise vary their teaching; a small minority employ D/HH teachers who teach D/HH students, while others have hearing teachers who teach D/HH students, and still others have integrated classrooms. Depending on the classroom, D/HH students are taught by sign language, lip reading, or both. There is no agreed-upon curriculum for D/HH students; instead, they learn from a curriculum based on the national guidelines for hearing students, which do not encompass many aspects of the evolving D/HH culture in Tanzania and East Africa.

Inadequate funding for the country's educational infrastructure has limited the educational opportunities available to students with disabilities. D/HH students can choose from 18 primary schools devoted solely to the deaf and hard-of-hearing.¹⁴ Additionally, a small number of teachers for the deaf and hard-of-hearing work in schools for the hearing. The number of teachers specifically trained for D/HH students is also inadequate, particularly in rural areas that would require D/HH students to travel long distances. In a country of nearly 400,000 square miles, still-developing transportation infrastructure, and a per-capita GDP of \$610, this geographical barrier means that the rural deaf and hard-of-hearing face severe hurdles to receiving adequate schooling.¹⁵

¹³ "Tanzanian Sign Language in the Language Cloud." *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, n.d. Web. 06 Apr. 2015.

¹⁴ United Republic of Tanzania: Principles and General Objectives of Education. Rep. Unesco, Sept. 2006. Web. http://www.ibe.unesco.org/Countries/WDE/2006/SUB-SAHARAN_AFRICA/United_Republic_of_Tanzania/United_Republic_of_Tanzania.pdf.

¹⁵ Kiyaga, Nassozi B., and Donald F. Moores. "Deafness in Sub-Saharan Africa." *American Annals of the Deaf* 148.1 (2003): 18-24.

Section 3: Program Overview

This section of the report will explain the background and content of the program under evaluation.

Improving & Expanding Access to Primary Education for Deaf/Hard of Hearing children in Tanzania (IEA) is the “realigned” version of a program that began in 2010. It was designed and implemented by Global Deaf Connection (GDC) with funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

The objectives, planned activities (“Strategy”), and expected outcomes of the program are summarized below. The information is taken directly from GDC’s original and realigned proposals to USAID, edited for length and consistency of language. (See Appendix B for the verbatim text.) While this report is concerned primarily with the realigned program, the original is included here to provide context.

Original Proposal:

Improving and Expanding Early Primary School Education for Learners with Hearing Impairments in Zanzibar and Mtwara Regions of Tanzania (2010)

Objective:

To create a sustainable system of quality primary education in Tanzania’s Zanzibar and Mtwara Regions for all primary school children including those roughly 10,500 with hearing impairments (deaf and hard-of-hearing) and communication difficulties.

Strategy

1. Baseline-survey of achievement and needs of students and continuous monitoring of achievement goals disaggregated by various interventions
2. Preparation of a visual education program within teacher training colleges
3. Preparation, tutoring, mentoring and provision of hearing aids, sign language interpreters and visual aids to a core of D/HH participants as they complete teacher training
4. Provision of visual and hearing aids when appropriate to school-aged D/HH children
5. Promotion of Tanzanian Sign Language and Zanzibar Sign Language and research to be used in the creation of instructional materials and training of sign language teachers
6. Training of Tanzanian Sign Language and Zanzibar Sign Language interpreters
7. Advocate for international and national level policies to improve education and employment for people with disabilities
8. Continual monitoring of changes from baseline data, semi-annual adjustments to programs, and annual evaluations

Expected Outcomes

- 30 D/HH graduates of teacher training
- 200 D/HH children enrolled per year to be taught by teachers skilled in sign language and visually instructional techniques
- Increased awareness and acceptance of the deaf and hard-of-hearing in affected communities
- Visual and heuristic techniques introduced at teacher training colleges are sustained beyond the end of the program
- Increased academic performance among students in schools where program graduates are placed
- Program graduates are more competent at visual and heuristic education than graduates of other teacher training colleges
- At least 2,000 D/HH children provided with hearing aids and other assistive devices

Realigned Proposal:

Improving & Expanding Access to Primary Education for Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing Children in Tanzania (2014)

Objectives

The primary objective of the proposed “re-aligned” intervention is to create a new model of improving and expanding access education for D/HH children in Tanzania, beginning with the Mtwara Region. Specifically:

- Directly impact up to approximately 400 D/HH students per annum, as each of the four program participants will go forward to teach/mentor approximately 100 D/HH students per year at their respective schools.
- Facilitate a sensitization on simple signs and best practice inclusion of the deaf and hard-of-hearing with 10 MTTC lecturers, one TSL interpreter and two administrators, and a sensitization on optimal collaboration with TSL interpreters.
- Facilitate a more general sensitization for as many as 20 USAID and US Embassy Tanzania personnel.
- Build capacity for the four D/HH participants to maximize their inclusive education at MTTC, their future inclusive employment at schools/units with D/HH students while capturing these achievements in a success story video.
- Produce a 30-minute video in which the four program graduates will tell their success stories in sign language with Kiswahili narration. The video will be uploaded to YouTube and social networking platforms, and up to 50 DVDs will be printed and used to:
 - Sensitize up to 50 additional key partners and stakeholders (including 20 USAID and U.S. Embassy personnel) about the benefits of inclusion in education and employment.

- Role model Deaf success for up to 150 D/HH students at up to 20 deaf schools/units for the deaf.
- Provide mentorship to each of the four D/HH Mtwara TTC by a Deaf professional in the education sector, accompanied by a Deaf Education professor, who will role model best practice inclusion and utilization of support services in education and employment.

Strategy

USAID/Tanzania funded support activities:

1. Mentor TSL interpreter at Mtwara TTC per best practices from the interpretation sector and strategies to collaborate with D/HH students, along with hearing colleagues at the college.
2. Mentor D/HH students in best practice methods to work with the TSL interpreter, and to include themselves at Mtwara TTC and at their future place of work.
3. Support the Mtwara TTC graduates who are already placed at schools/units with a mentorship visit from a seasoned Deaf teacher and Deaf Education professor from U.S. The Deaf mentor and Deaf Education professor will share inclusive education practices and experiences with the D/HH teacher and also school administration to ensure a smooth and successful piloted placement.

Leveraged in kind contribution support activities:

1. Introduce USAID and U.S. Embassy Dar personnel to simple signs and inclusive concepts, field questions about disability and development in Tanzania and worldwide.
2. Source and vet technical team (video editor, voice narrator, etc.) to produce “TZ Deaf Teacher Success Stories” DVD-ROMs from the four D/HH Mtwara TTC graduates for key partners, stakeholders and schools/units for the Deaf.
3. Confirm technical team for “Deaf success stories” DVD-ROM, identify terms of reference and framework agreement for assignment.
4. Outline, script and rehearse success stories with the four D/HH MTC graduates.
5. Film final draft, five minute success stories from each of the four D/HH Mtwara TTC graduate.
6. Capture scenes from the four D/HH students at MTC and/or in their job placement. Also film interviews from supporting partners/stakeholders (i.e., MTTC principal, TSL interpreter, etc.).
7. Edit down first draft of “Deaf success skills” DVD-ROM, review and suggest revision.
8. Produce and distribute final draft “Deaf Success Skills” DVD-ROM, publishing 50 copies on DVD-ROM for distribution to project’s key partners/stakeholders and up to 20 schools/units for the Deaf.

9. Conduct external evaluation with five-person evaluation team from University of Minnesota. Organize and execute logistics, inclusive of identifying interviewees and interpreters (Kiswahili and TSL).

Section 4: Evaluation Outline

This section explains the structure and process of the evaluation.

The evaluation team composed a set of evaluation questions based on conversations with GDC leadership and on program documents such as the grant proposals summarized above. These questions went through several drafts as the team prepared for its fieldwork and as new information and priorities from stakeholders came to light.

Evaluation Questions

1. What were the strengths of the program?
2. What were the weaknesses of the program?
3. Is the program in Tanzania sustainable?
4. To what degree was the program beneficial?
5. To what degree was MTTC accessible to program participants?
6. In what ways were program participants supported?
7. How have D/HH students benefited from having D/HH teachers and role models?
8. What are the factors that GDC would need to consider to replicate the project?

Stakeholder Needs

The overall purpose of this evaluation is to aid GDC in improving the implementation and design of future programs. Much of the evaluation will focus on what went well and what could be improved with program design and implementation. The evaluation team intends the final document to serve as a summary of lessons learned and feedback from the key stakeholders for GDC to use in future projects.

The intended user of this evaluation is GDC, particularly GDC leadership. Since GDC leadership has the biggest stake in the information collected for this report, the report presents its findings and makes its recommendations with these stakeholders in mind. Other key stakeholders, however, such as USAID, the Tanzanian Ministry of Education, CHAVITA, and CHAVIZA may also draw important lessons from this report.

Section 5: Evaluation Methods

In order to answer the evaluation questions and provide GDC with meaningful information regarding their program in Tanzania, this evaluation relies primarily on formal interviews with primary stakeholders, informal interviews with additional stakeholders, observations in Tanzanian schools, and a review of program documents.

The evaluation team conducted 16 interviews. Formal interviews were planned in advance with standardized questionnaires, whereas informal interviews were conducted with stakeholders as the opportunity presented itself. The questions in the informal interviews dealt with the strengths and weaknesses of the program and the things GDC should consider as it plans future programs in other countries. A full list of the stakeholders the team interviewed is presented below.

Formal Interviews

- Tanzanian Ministry of Education
- USAID
- GDC Program Participants (6)
- Mtwara Teacher Training College Staff
- CHAVITA
- CHAVIZA
- D/HH Students (2 groups)

Informal Interviews

- GDC Staff
- Zanzibar Special Education Unit
- Teachers in Mtwara who train program participants

The team visited three classrooms that taught D/HH students exclusively, as well as multiple classrooms that taught both D/HH and hearing students. While the teachers in these classrooms were not graduates of the GDC program, these visits provided context regarding the reality of D/HH education in Tanzania and helped the team formulate its conclusions and recommendations.

The team also reviewed key program documents, including grant proposals and quarterly reports. These documents helped the team construct a timeline of program activities and better understand the challenges that GDC faced while implementing the program.

Evaluation Framework

This evaluation stems from a USAID requirement that IEA undergo an external evaluation in its fifth and final year. With this requirement in mind, the team chose a summative evaluation approach—which examines the overall successes and

shortcomings of a given program at the end of its lifespan—for certain parts of the evaluation, particularly in regard to the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

GDC's interest in this evaluation extends beyond USAID's requirement, however. To better suit their needs, the team chose a developmental approach in other parts of the evaluation, particularly with regard to considerations for expansion and future projects. As Michael Quinn Patton writes, a developmental evaluation includes "asking evaluative questions, applying evaluation logic...to inform ongoing decision making and adaptations."¹⁶ Since GDC will continue its work and is planning on implementing similar projects in other East-African countries, this report focuses on what GDC as an organization can learn from its experience in Tanzania in order to be successful with future ventures elsewhere.

In regards to data analysis, the team took a deductive approach to analyzing the information it collected in Tanzania. Upon completing its fieldwork, the team identified themes that arose in the stakeholder interviews. Once these themes were identified, team members revisited the interview recordings and field notes to find evidence to support its findings and contextualize its recommendations.

Shortcomings of Proposed Methods

The team is confident that this evaluation provides an accurate and fair assessment of GDC's program in Tanzania. The evaluation is not, however, without its shortcomings. First, there was a significant language barrier during the interviews. Since English was the second language of many of the stakeholders the evaluation team interviewed, some questions may have been misunderstood and some responses may not have fully represented a stakeholder's thoughts on the question. TSL interpretation further complicates the evaluation. None of the evaluation team's members can communicate in TSL, and the evaluation therefore relies on the assumption that the TSL interpretation, which was at times conducted by GDC staff, was accurate and fully representative not only of the questions but also of the stakeholder's responses.

Second, this evaluation falls short in regards to concrete evidence of improved education outcomes for D/HH students and changes in the quality of life for program participants. To the team's knowledge, no comprehensive data exists regarding learning outcomes for the D/HH students who were taught by IEA graduates, nor did the team have an objective way to measure changes in participants' quality of life. Even a reliable count of the D/HH students who have been taught by GDC program graduates is not available. Therefore, the team's ability to assess IEA's impact on student outcomes and participant well-being is limited. Any benefits or detriments presented in this evaluation are based on the self-reported perceptions of students and participants.

¹⁶ Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. Guilford Press.

Section 6: Findings

This section of the report will present the evaluation's findings, first in terms of the objectives outlined in the realigned grant proposal and second in terms of the evaluation questions introduced in Section 3.

Note: In this section and the following section, the team uses quotes from the interviews to support its points. The quotes were transcribed from audio recordings and edited for length but not for grammar.

Realigned Program Objectives

To review the realigned program's objectives as the evaluation team understands them, IEA was supposed to:

- Provide approximately 400 D/HH students with an inclusive education from program graduates
- Facilitate a sensitization on simple signs and best practice inclusion with 10 MTTC lecturers, one TSL interpreter, and two administrators, and a sensitization on optimal collaboration with TSL interpreters
- Facilitate a more general sensitization for as many as 20 USAID and US Embassy Tanzania personnel
- Sensitize workplaces where program graduates work so co-workers have a general understanding of inclusion best practices
- Produce a video of program participant success stories
- Provide program participants with professional mentors

The exact number of students who have been taught by graduates of the program is unknown (see "Shortcomings of Proposed Methods" in Section 5), but stakeholders with an interest in the program's success believed the program did not meet its target. Interviews with MTTC lecturers and USAID revealed that they had not received sensitization training; in fact, the MTTC lecturers had not heard of GDC. The team's conversations with program participants and their coworkers suggested that no sensitization has been conducted at their workplace. The team also heard no evidence that a video had been produced or mentors had been provided.

What are the strengths of the program?

GDC's program in Tanzania has taken the first steps towards achieving an important goal. D/HH primary school students clearly stand to benefit from the practical support and role models it offers, and D/HH high school graduates appreciate the employment opportunities it provides.

"There are some deaf people who have benefited from the program and deaf children are now being taught because of that."

“[Deaf primary school students] learn about sign language. They learn it from the deaf teacher. The hearing teacher, they use total lip reading, not sign language.”

It also has broader benefits for the communities in which it operates. By their interactions with others, program participants spread awareness of D/HH issues. The evaluation team observed at least a couple cases in which this interaction seemed to cause durable changes in attitudes or behavior.

“There is one [instructor at MTTC] that has benefitted from this project, because now he’s at [another college] focusing on special education. When I was signing, he was very interested, asking questions, ‘how can I do this and this and this?’ I gave him some information, and now he’s pursuing his master’s in special education.”

The team also heard positive feedback about some resources that were offered early in the program but later discontinued.

“I think if...the computer classes could have been continued...to the rest of the Deaf community in Mtwara.... If that had continued, I would feel, I suppose, that at least two or three candidates would be interested, and have the vocation, and probably sign up from Mtwara itself. That would also reduce the costs—you know, transport costs and all that—and would still be doing something valuable for the community.”

Perhaps the most encouraging strength of the program was that some program participants expressed an increased sense of agency and a belief that their lives would be better. For example, when asked how her/his life would be different after participating in the program, one participant responded:

“I will be a teacher. I can work at the school. So it will solve my finance problem because I will have a salary. And at the same times I can solve many problems to my family. I can help my community raising awareness about the deaf students or about the Deaf community. So together we can solve a problems to the Deaf community and the deaf students into the schools. And so many things like that.”

What are the weaknesses of the program?

Even though the interview questions were carefully worded to draw out positive as well as negative feedback, a substantial majority of the responses focused on the program’s shortcomings. It is clear that the weaknesses outweighed the strengths in the eyes of most stakeholders. Based on their comments, the evaluation team identified four particular aspects of GDC’s operations that warrant attention and improvement.

A. Communication

Stakeholders consistently reported that GDC did not communicate adequately with its partners in Tanzania. Specifically, interviewees said the *frequency* of communication

from GDC was less than they expected for a project of this scale, and less than they needed to fulfill their own roles in its implementation.

“We didn’t have anyone in GDC with whom we could discuss our problems.”

“Steering committees tend to meet every three or six months. GDC came for the first time when they came to Tanzania but then they disappeared. We expected them to come back and tell us what is going on and what they have achieved and what their challenges are.”

“When I said there was no communication, I meant there was *no* communication. Sometimes there may have been a short email message, but nothing else.”

“Communication is very important. If you start a program but the actors do not communicate, there is no success. And during this project there was no communication...It was a one-man show.”

B. Managing Perceptions

The aforementioned communication problems created negative perceptions among some stakeholders—for example, that GDC was not being transparent about its activities, that it did not respect them as equals in their collaboration, or that it was not fully committed to the program. These perceptions clearly strained some of the relationships on which the program’s success depended.

“I’ll give you an example. If I come to America with the aim of assisting you, we meet on the first day I arrive, and we talk. Then, from there, I disappear and you don’t see me and you continue working but I don’t give you any kind of information. How do you feel?”

“Deaf people here in Zanzibar, we are the *aim* of this project, but through GDC we get just a follow-up because we didn’t cooperate for anything.”

Not only was the quantity of interaction inadequate; many stakeholders were also unhappy with the quality of their contact with GDC. GDC’s former chief of party in Tanzania, Ron Brouillette, had a particularly bad reputation among the stakeholders interviewed for this report.

“When Ron wanted to do anything, he wanted for himself without cooperating.”

“[Ron] wanted people to see that he’s working, doing something, but [he was] not progressing”

Stakeholder: “He was giving some information, ‘just prepare this and this and this,’ and I was doing it. Meanwhile, he’s not working with GDC; he’s working with [a different organization].”

Evaluation Team: “So, to clarify that, Ron would tell you what to do, but he wouldn’t help, and instead he was working with this other organization?”

Stakeholder: “Yeah.”

Although Ron was named specifically as the cause of many stakeholders’ frustrations, it was not clear that the situation improved significantly under Ron’s successor.

Evaluation Team: “Has your experience in the program changed since Robin took over as the Chief of Party?”

Stakeholder: “I cannot say because there are a lot of issues of which we are not informed.”

C. Managing Expectations

The realigned proposal was intended to lower the expectations from the original grant in light of disappointing early results, but the responses from many stakeholders suggests they were not clearly (or not at all) notified that the program’s goals had been scaled back.

Evaluation Team: “Has the partnership with GDC changed in the last five years?”

Stakeholder: “No.”

“In fact, when we started this project, we were so enthusiastic that we were now going to solve the problem of teachers in schools for the deaf because we believed that if we can train a deaf person to become a teacher of a deaf child, then we are likely to achieve a lot because for the deaf to communicate with a deaf person, it is very easy. They can easily understand.... Along the way, discouragement.”

Significant parts of the realigned proposal did not seem to have been implemented at the time of the evaluation team’s field work. For example, the teachers at MTTC told the evaluation team they had no knowledge of the GDC program. (They were happy to have D/HH participants in their classrooms, but were unaware of the program that got them there.) This not only suggests a shortcoming in GDC’s publicity efforts, but also means these teachers did not receive the sensitivity training envisioned in the realigned proposal.

Evaluation Team: “Do you want to describe what you know about the Global Deaf Connection Program?”

Stakeholders: [No response]

Evaluation Team: “Do any of you know about the Global Deaf Connection program?”

Stakeholder 1: “Can you explain so we can understand what you are talking about?”

Evaluation Team: “The program that allows for the interpreter and the deaf students to be here—do you know about the program, the Global Deaf Connection Program?”

Stakeholder 1: “No I do not know about this”

Evaluation Team: “No?”

Stakeholder 1: “No.” [The other stakeholders agreed.]

Evaluation Team: “Did you guys receive any training on students with disabilities, from any program?”

Stakeholder 1: “No”

Stakeholder 2: “For me, I can say that I have. I am a PE teacher. I received training with USAID on how to teach physical disabled youth....”

Evaluation Team: “Do you wish you would have received training on how to teach and how to incorporate deaf and hard-of-hearing students—how to better teach or incorporate them into your classroom? Students with these disabilities? Do you wish this was a training you could have received?”

Stakeholder 1: “Most of us we have not gone through the special education. So some of us we can say we don’t have any training on how to deal with special needs.”

Evaluation Team: “If a program like this, like Global Deaf Connection, came to Mtwara Teacher Training College, for a day or an afternoon, and provided a training, is that something you would find beneficial?”

Stakeholder 1: “Of course”

Stakeholder 2: “Yeah, of course, yeah, because when we’re dealing with disabled students, so when at least you get the training, that can help us to accommodate them in the class, that would be helpful, that would be very helpful.”

D. Perceived Use of Resources

Some of the stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation either implied or openly speculated that GDC had not used its resources efficiently in implementing IEA. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to assess the truth of these perceptions, but they pose a problem for GDC even if they’re false. For example, one source said that several years ago GDC developed a sign language dictionary as part of its efforts in Zanzibar. The dictionary had glossy cardstock pages and full-color illustrations, suggesting it had been produced at some expense. Because GDC failed to involve the relevant government offices in its design, however, the final product did not meet the government’s standards and was rejected as culturally inappropriate for use in public schools. In other words, a greater effort to include local stakeholders could have avoided this failure.

“The big problem is that the dictionary is not allowed to be used in Zanzibar because of bad or poor cooperation with CHAVIZA and [the] Special Education [Unit].... When you want to make something in a

project, you must cooperate with some people who are in high levels such as the Ministry of Education. They didn't cooperate with them."

"Hence, USAID, in a way, became also discouraged and said that they were just misusing the money for the support or something that was not really coming forth. I said, 'You are right, USAID, for that, because even...[we are]...not seeing really what is happening.'"

To cite another example, the realigned proposal includes as one of its objectives the production of a video showcasing the program's accomplishments. Due to the small number of participants, however, it has little success to showcase. Meanwhile, several of the interviews suggest that some participants had not received all of the financial support they were originally led to expect (see "In what ways were participants supported?" below). These circumstances suggest that the program's funds would be better spent recruiting and fully supporting more participants.

Is the program sustainable?

In order to assess the sustainability of the GDC project in Tanzania, our team asked Tanzanian education officials and USAID staff about the feasibility of the program continuing after the USAID grant ends and GDC is no longer operating in Tanzania. A USAID official noted that the goal of these programs is for the host government to sustain the program itself once the grant money is exhausted. However, a Tanzanian government official stated, "the government would have to take the responsibility of taking care of it because it is part of what the government is supposed to do. Only that sometimes we lack some [resources] to make sure things go on."

Stakeholders also raised issue with the fact that the project has been resource-intensive thus far. To date, only six teachers have completed the program, despite the funds provided by the large USAID grant. This led one stakeholder to rhetorically ask, "What will be the impact of six teachers?"

Considering the apparent reluctance of the Tanzanian government to fund this program, as well as the perceived resource-intensive nature of the project, this evaluation concludes that the IEA program is not sustainable without considerable and ongoing outside funding and support.

To what degree was the program beneficial?

As stated above, the program has some clear strengths. In terms of long-term outcomes for participants and D/HH students, our interviews suggest that the program does have clear benefits.

When asked if the program was a success, one stakeholder responded, "Yes. There is an increased number of people attending the college in Mtwara." Another stakeholder responded when asked if GDC delivered as promised, another said, "Yes. There are some deaf people who have benefited from their programs and deaf children are now being taught because of that." Our interviews suggest that the IEA program has

additional benefits, but these quotes are more suitable for our discussion on “How have D/HH students benefited from having D/HH teachers?” on page 25.

To what degree was MTTC accessible to program participants?

Interviews suggest that the provision of interpreters was especially important in making MTTC an accessible learning environment.

“...[L]ater on, I had an opportunity to come to Mtwara Teacher’s College, here. When I came here, the barriers, communication barriers, was sort out because there was an interpreter so the environment was a bit conducive to me, so it helps me to cooperate and participate in different activities in the classroom and outside.”

“I think my favorite part of Mtwara Teachers College, when I was remember about my past studies, life, when I was at the primary and secondary school, there was a communication barriers. But when I came to Mtwara, here, life was simple because there was an interpreter help me into the classrooms. So this part was my favorite. When I go into the classroom I was happy and I was participating in the class because there is a sign language interpreter. But the secondary and the primary was not.”

When asked what he/she would change about MTTC, one interviewee responded,

“My wish is that Mtwara Teachers College has an opportunity to enroll students with hearing impairment so if there is an opportunity here, we’re trying to find out many students who are hard of hearing to get into the college. At that time, also, they have to increase more interpreters. More sign language interpreters to help because now we are only one interpreter who is working full time. So my wish is an opportunity to increase more students and increase more interpreters.

These quotes indicate that while students value their time at MTTC and are aided by the interpreter, additional interpreters and the presence of more D/HH students could make the environment more inclusive.

In what ways were participants supported?

Some stakeholders said they did not receive as much support from GDC as they were led to expect. The evaluation team does not have enough information to determine whether GDC actually promised participants more than it delivered or whether some participants simply misunderstood the provisions of the program. Whether real or perceived, this lack of student support may have harmed the program’s reputation (and therefore recruitment) by leaving its participants dissatisfied.

Stakeholder: “Sometimes Ron promised someone that ‘He’ll be paid something like this, just teach them.’ He told them to come down here,

just taking a photo, and I don't know where he disappeared. That was what we witnessed sometimes.”

Evaluation Team: “Let me just clarify that. He would say, ‘There’s going to be this training, this workshop,’ or whatever, [he would] advertise it, get people to come, take their picture, [but then there was] no training, no workshop, nothing?”

Stakeholder: “No training, no workshops.”

“My experiences going through the GDC program start out great. GDC provide me with hearing aids and promise to pay my college and necessary expense. However, communicating with them has been a big challenge. For example, it took more than a year to get back replace hearing aids. After my mom and I picked up the hearing aids, I have not heard from them again for three years now. Also, there is no follow-up support as promised.”

Regardless of whether GDC delivered what it promised, however, some stakeholders clearly felt the support was less than the participants needed.

“Ron called us. He said that for this time we want you to go to Tanzania mainland, and he said take this 4,000 [Tanzanian Shillings (TZS)] only for transport to go and come back. Just 4,000 [TZS] is not enough for going and coming back.... We going there in Tanzania mainland for 20,000 [TZS], and so we ask him, ‘What about the money for food, shelter, and other things?’ He said that he don’t know.”

Although the interviews collected several critical comments regarding GDC’s support of participants, some participants expressed gratitude that GDC had provided support in attending school, particularly with school fees and tuition:

Stakeholder: “GDC helped me a lot. Many things, because my family, they didn’t have money for my education. But after I connected with GDC, now I can continue to study. One, to pay for school fees, that is one thing GDC was helping and was providing my family. Second, for me, other things apart from the school fees. I mean the school, the...”

Evaluation Team: “Does that mean school clothing?”

Stakeholder: “Yeah, they pay for stationery, other things, apart from school fees. And even transport from home to the college, from college to the home.”

How have D/HH students benefited from having D/HH teachers and role models?

The team’s interviews with D/HH students, D/HH teachers, and coworkers of D/HH teachers indicate that D/HH students benefit greatly from having a D/HH teacher. When asked about how students like working with their D/HH teacher (a graduate of the program), one stakeholder said:

“They like to go to secondary [school] because they’ve seen him as a deaf from that, because he is deaf, because of that, they are now in the emotion for them also to want to go to secondary.”

Teachers who had worked with a graduate of the program in the past said that the graduate encouraged the students, and that the students were excited to have a D/HH teacher. They also thought the graduate demonstrated to the students that they could also have opportunities in the future.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of how D/HH students may benefit from having a D/HH teacher came from a program participant’s experience in the classroom. When asked if students benefitted from having a D/HH teacher, the program participant responded:

“An example is a girl. She came here. She has a bad behavior. She didn’t wanted to learn, but after him to work or to sit with her, but now she is going well. There was a child who was eight years. He came here three weeks ago now. After the parents to bring him here, but all the time he was disturbed.... [H]e just want to run away and crying all the time. But now he is already settled because of [the program participant].”

Section 7: Recommendations

Lessons Learned and Best Practices

The following conclusions are based not only on stakeholders' answers to particular questions, but also on the evaluation team's overall impressions of the program as a whole (see the appendix for a comprehensive list of interview questions). GDC should improve its operations in the following areas before it tries to replicate the IEA program in other countries.

1. Conduct stakeholder assessment and stakeholder engagement plan

For future projects, GDC should thoroughly assess who the primary stakeholders are in a given country or region, determine how the interests and assets of those stakeholders align with GDC's interests, and create a plan to communicate and engage with those stakeholders. A thorough assessment of stakeholders before implementing the project would:

- Develop relationships with key players that could help identify beneficiaries and help GDC navigate the local context
- Provide GDC with partners that could help sustain the project after GDC leaves
- Alleviate concerns that GDC is not transparent and does not communicate with stakeholders

What future stakeholder assessments and engagement plans look like will depend on the context in which GDC is working. In general, however, GDC should consider establishing common goals and setting clear milestones that would indicate project success for both GDC and the stakeholders.

2. Identify program participants before implementing the program

A proper stakeholder engagement plan as noted above will help facilitate a more accurate estimate of the size of the population from which program participants will be drawn. While it is impossible to identify in advance every person who would be eligible for a given program, the number of people who actually completed teacher training in the IEA program is small relative to the size of the USAID grant and the original goals. This suggests either a poor understanding of how many people would be eligible for the teacher training, a poor assessment of local interest in the opportunity, or a poor job of publicizing that opportunity. Prior to writing future proposals, GDC should identify potential program beneficiaries and put a plan in place to ensure that these beneficiaries receive services.

Again, having strong relationships with stakeholders and having a clear understanding of the local context is critical for this step. Conducting a rigorous assessment before the project design phase will allow GDC to have a better idea of how many participants will likely complete the program and will allow GDC to identify changes to their program to better fit the needs of the local context before implementation.

3. Develop a comprehensive communication plan

Since stakeholders frequently expressed concern regarding communication, it is imperative that planning for future projects include a clear communication protocol. Some of the stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation had not heard from GDC in several years, while others reported only scarce communication. As part of any agreement with stakeholders or staff, a defined procedure would help GDC avoid such mishaps in the future. The elements of this communication plan could include:

- Quarterly meetings with all key stakeholders (individually or even as a group)
- Comprehensive newsletters that outline progress and next steps for the project
- Invitations for site visits so that stakeholders can see the progress of the program

These practices would not only make stakeholders feel more included, but also provide GDC with regular feedback about how the community is interacting with the program

4. Reconsider the program management structure

Many stakeholders identified GDC's former chief of party by name in their criticisms of the program. GDC explained in its realigned proposal that this staff member experienced some medical problems during the program's implementation that forced him to take at least one leave of absence and eventually to leave the job altogether. It further explained that the process of finding and training a replacement chief of party diverted resources from other areas of the program. The evaluation team is not entirely convinced, however, that this staff change addressed stakeholders' complaints, because none of the stakeholders mentioned an improvement over time in their experience with the program. GDC should consider dividing the chief of party's responsibilities among several staff members so that the success of its next program does not depend so heavily on a particular individual.

Several stakeholders suggested that a steering committee would have been beneficial to the program. This committee would improve communication not only between GDC staff, but also between GDC and the local community. It would ensure that the activities that GDC had planned for a given period would take place. As one stakeholder suggested:

"A steering committee would make sure that everything has been planned and has been implemented and has been successful because a weakness, when you're telling it to the committee, anyone can give out his ideas. We planned this and this, but this is not yet going, so how can we overcome this.... So it will be like your watchdog, supervisor."

Such a committee would ensure that GDC is meeting project milestones, adapting effectively to unforeseen challenges, and communicating progress clearly and effectively.

5. Reconsider the program structure

In general, stakeholders genuinely liked the idea behind IEA. Participants appreciate the opportunity to train as teachers, government officials wanted to expand access to education for D/HH students, and D/HH students liked having D/HH teachers. The evaluation team did find some opportunities, however, to potentially improve the structure of the program that could help future GDC programs.

First, the program has a mixed record in securing employment for its graduates. Based on conversations with GDC personnel, the evaluation team understood that employment for graduates at government-run schools was considered the best-case outcome for program participants. Some of the graduates interviewed for this evaluation, however, were working in private schools or as private tutors for D/HH children. If government-run schools are the priority, GDC should establish firm agreements with government education offices to ensure that participants will be able to find jobs upon graduation. If this is not feasible, then GDC should consider forming more deliberate relationships with private schools to secure employment there.

Second, some of the graduates interviewed for this evaluation did not know TSL, and instead used their limited hearing ability or lip-reading to communicate. It was not clear to the evaluation team whether this represented a personal choice on the part of these graduates or a shortcoming on the part of GDC. In any case, it raises a question about the goals of the program. If the primary goal is to provide employment opportunities to D/HH Tanzanians, then the graduates' language of instruction is not necessarily important. But if the primary goal is to provide D/HH students with a better education, then the graduates' knowledge of TSL might be considered very important. In that case, GDC should place more emphasis on TSL training, and might even consider opening the program to hearing participants who are willing to learn TSL. The latter option would have the additional benefit of supplementing low enrollment among the deaf and hard-of-hearing.

Third, some participants expressed an interest in careers other than teaching, or indicated that their ambitions did not stop in the classroom. Again, this raises a question about GDC's goals. If it wants to focus on employment opportunities, GDC should explore the possibility of sponsoring training for other careers in addition to teaching.

Section 8: Conclusion

The evaluation team found that GDC worked on an important issue that is currently not receiving enough support in Tanzania. Many stakeholders expressed keen interest in this program and it succeeded in helping a small number of graduates and their students. However, the team also heard consistent negative feedback from stakeholders regarding GDC's on-the-ground operations and ability to operationalize its mission. These weaknesses alienated key stakeholders and harmed GDC's reputation in the country. The team nevertheless believes that a program like IEA could be successful in the future if GDC learns and grows from the findings and recommendations in this report.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

Questions for students who are taught by a program graduate

1. Tell me about a typical day.
2. What do you like to do when you have free time?
3. What's your favorite part of school?
4. Tell us about how your teacher relates to you.
5. What was school like before you had a deaf teacher?
 - a. How is school different now?
6. What do you want your life to look like in your future?
 - a. Has this changed since you met your teacher?
 - i. If so, how did you see your future before you met your teacher?
7. Tell us about what it is like learning from a deaf teacher.
 - a. Has it helped you learning? How?
8. Tell me about how you communicate with friends since the time you first had a deaf teacher?
 - a. Was it different before?
 - b. How?
 - c. How do your friends communicate with you?
9. How does your family communicate with you?
 - a. Has communication changed since having a deaf teacher?
10. Has your relationship with your family changed since having a deaf teacher?
 - a. PROMPT: Easier to get along?
11. Is there anything else? Do you have any questions for me?

Questions for graduates of the program

1. Tell us about your job.
 - a. Did you have a job prior to working with Global Deaf Connection?
 - i. [IF YES] What was your previous job?
 - b. Where do you currently teach?
 - c. What form do you teach?
2. Tell us about the Global Deaf Connection program.
 - a. How did you come to know about this program?
 - b. Have you referred other people to the program?
3. What was your favorite part of the Global Deaf Connection Program?
4. What was your least favorite part of the Global Deaf Connection Program?
5. In your opinion, how helpful was the Global Deaf Connection scholarship and training for your work?

- a. Can you give me an example of this?
- 6. Can you give me an example of how the GDC program was helpful outside of your work?
- 7. Do you think your students benefit **academically** from having a teacher who signs?
 - a. [IF NO]
 - i. What do you think would be beneficial to deaf or hard of hearing students, if not signing?
 - b. [IF YES]
 - i. Describe for me an example of a student benefitting from having a teacher who signs.
- 8. Do you think your students benefit **outside** of school from having a teacher who signs?
 - a. Can you explain?
- 9. How have the future opportunities for your students changed by having you as a deaf teacher in their lives?
 - a. Can you explain or elaborate?
- 10. Do you see change in your students since starting at this school?
 - a. Can you describe this change?
- 11. [PROMPT FOR INTERVIEWER: ask follow ups RE increased communications, time spent at school, etc.]
- 12. Think back to your time at the Mtwara Teacher Training College,
 - a. What did you like about it?
 - b. What did you wish was different?
 - c. What were the other people like?
- 13. Tell us about your mentor.
 - a. PROMPTS: Are you still in contact with him/her?
- 14. Did they ever help you with your work?
- 15. Tell us about the strengths of this program?
- 16. Tell us about the weaknesses of this program?
- 17. If GDC was not present, how might the program continue?
- 18. If you were in charge of Global Deaf Connection, what country would you bring it to next?
 - a. What would you consider before replicating it somewhere else?
 - b. What would you do differently if you were to implement it in another country?
- 19. Is there anything you can think of that I should know about Global Deaf Connection, or your experience as a deaf instructor, that I haven't asked?

Questions for participants still at MTTC

1. Tell us about your life before you came to the Mtwara Teacher Training College.
2. What career did you hope to have before you entered this program?
 - a. Did you feel as though that career was within your ability to get?
 - i. [IF DIFFERENT] What made you change your mind and want to become a teacher?
 - b. What were your relationships like with your friends or family?
 - c. Did you know other Deaf or hard of hearing people before you came here?
3. Tell us about the Global Deaf Connection program.
 - a. How did you come to learn about this program?
 - b. Have you referred other people to the program?
4. How do you think your personal life now is different because of your time in this program?
 - a. Can you describe this for me?
5. What is your favorite part about studying at Mtwara Teacher Training College?
6. What do you wish was different at MTTC?
 - a. What would you add to the program?
 - b. What would you take out from the program
7. Tell us about your friends here at MTTC.
8. How has your understanding of deaf education changed or grown since starting the program?
9. Describe your relationships or interactions with your teachers at Mtwara Teacher Training College.
 - a. Tell us about the Mtwara Teacher Training College administrator.
10. How do you think your personal life will be different after you graduate from the Mtwara Teacher Training College?
11. What are your goals are after you graduate from the program?
 - a. PROMPTS:
 - i. How will this program help you achieve those goals?
 - ii. What could the program have done better to help you accomplish these goals?
 - b. Have these goals changed since beginning the program?
12. Are there any resources you which you had at Mtwara Teacher Training College that you don't?
13. In thinking about your future as a teacher,
 - a. Why do you think it's important for Deaf students to have a deaf teacher?
 - b. Why do you think it's important for other teachers to work with a Deaf teacher?

- c. Why do you think it's important for a community to have a Deaf teacher working in it
- 14. Tell us about your mentor.
 - a. PROMPTS: Are you still in contact with him/her?
- 15. Did they ever help you with your work?
- 16. Tell us about the strengths of this program?
- 17. Overall, what do you wish this program would have done differently?
- 18. What do you see as the challenges of sustaining this program without Global Deaf Connection support?
- 19. If you were in charge of Global Deaf Connection, what country would you bring it to next?
 - a. What would you consider before replicating it somewhere else?
 - b. What would you do differently if you were to implement it in another country?
- 20. Is there anything you can think of that I should know about Global Deaf Connection, or your experience as a deaf instructor, that I haven't asked?

Questions for USAID

- 1. What role does Global Deaf Connection currently play in Tanzania?
- 2. Prior to Global Deaf Connection's work in Tanzania, what other efforts were there to educate deaf and hard-of-hearing people in Tanzania?
- 3. What was the nature of USAID's partnership with Global Deaf Connection?
- 4. How does the Global Deaf Connection project address the broader development goals that USAID has in Tanzania?
- 5. What challenges do you see facing the project in Tanzania once the USAID grant has ended?
- 6. What opportunities do you see for the project once the USAID grant has ended?
 - a. Do you see any other potential organizations taking the lead on this project?
 - b. If so, who?
- 7. What role do you see USAID playing in future deaf education or deaf empowerment projects in Tanzania?
- 8. What indicators do USAID use to determine whether or not this project was successful?
 - a. Using those indicators, in what ways has the project been successful?
 - b. What do you think has led to these successes?
 - i. Outside of these indicators, are there any other successes that this project has had? Describe.
 - c. How has this project been unsuccessful?

- i. Do you have any examples to illustrate this?
- d. What could the project have done better to succeed?
- e. In your, or USAID's, opinion has Global Deaf Connection missed any key areas in the implementation of their project that you know of?
- 9. Have there been any problems working with Global Deaf Connection in Tanzania?
 - a. Do you think GDC handled these problems effectively?
- 10. Under what circumstances would USAID in Tanzania fund another project with Global Deaf Connection?
- 11. If Global Deaf Connection were planning to implement another project in another East African country, what contextual factors should the organization consider before the planning and implementation process?
- 12. Where in East Africa would USAID like to see a deaf-outreach project implemented?
 - a. Why does USAID think that this country would be appropriate?
- 13. How would you like to have seen the project done differently in order to better meet the requirements of USAID?

Questions for CHAVITA/CHAVIZA

- 1. Describe your partnership with Global Deaf Connection.
 - a. In what ways has the partnership with Global Deaf Connection been easy.
 - i. How could this process be improved?
 - b. What have been the positive aspects of working with this project?
 - i. Can you provide any examples to illustrate?
 - c. What would you like to change in the future?
 - d. What do you feel have been major shortcomings of the project?
- 2. In what ways do you feel Global Deaf Connection is adding to the deaf/hard-of-hearing community in Tanzania?
 - a. In what ways is the organization missing, or not reaching, the deaf and hard-of-hearing community?
 - b. Are there any sub-populations that are missed in the outreach that you see? --- [follow this up / probe with possible silenced groups: minorities in the region, age, additional disabilities, gender, money, etc.]
 - c. What could Global Deaf Connection do to better reach the deaf and hard-of-hearing community?
- 3. Is this project sustainable without funding from USAID?
 - a. Do you think this program is worth sustaining?
 - b. Do you think that Global Deaf Connection is the best organization to run this program?

- i. Why do you feel this way?
- 4. Overall, do you consider the Global Deaf Connection project a success?
 - a. In which ways was this project successful?
 - i. Do you feel these successful moments happened frequently?
 - b. In which ways was this project unsuccessful?
 - i. Do you feel these types of unsuccessful moments happened frequently?
- 5. How has your relationship changed with Global Deaf Connection since it began?
 - a. Can you describe what you envision this partnership to look like in a year from now?
 - b. What about 5 years from now?
- 6. If Global Deaf Connection were to implement a similar project in a neighboring East African country, where would you think the most beneficial or appropriate place would be?
 - a. Can you describe or explain why you believe that.
 - b. What factors should GDC consider as they plan a future project in these areas?
- 7. Is there anything that you think I forgot to ask, or that you would like to add, that would help me to understand Global Deaf Connection, and evaluate its impact and possible growth opportunity?

Questions for the Ministry of Education

- 1. How would you describe deaf/HH education in Tanzania right now?
 - a. What educational challenges do deaf and hard-of-hearing students face?
 - b. What are the obstacles that you, as the representatives from the government, face to improving deaf/HH education in Tanzania?
- 2. What does the Ministry of Education view as the optimal education for deaf students?
- 3. What is the Ministry of Education doing to improve deaf/HH education?
- 4. What has the Ministry of Education done to improve deaf/HH education in the past?
 - a. What future programs does the Ministry of Education wish to implement or support surrounding deaf education?
- 5. Can you describe what you know about Global Deaf Connection program?
- 6. What is the nature of your relationship with Global Deaf Connection?
 - a. What were your expectations of the program?
 - i. How have they met or not met these expectations?
- 7. Overall, do you think the program has been successful?
 - i. Can you elaborate on that?

- b. What have been the successes of the program?
 - c. What have been the failures of the program?
- 8. Is this a project that the government would fund in the future?
 - a. WHY?
 - i. [IF NO] Is there anything that could be done to change this?
 - b. If GDC was not present, how might the program continue?
- 9. Describe your communication with Global Deaf Connection?
 - a. Do you consider their communication with the ministries to be sufficient?
- 10. How has Global Deaf Connection affected deaf/HH education in Tanzania?
 - a. What benefits do you see to general Tanzania society from this program?
- 11. Is there any other information about Global Deaf Connection or deaf/HH education I haven't asked that you feel I should know?

Questions for teachers at MTTC

- 1. Tell us about your role here at Mtwara Teacher Training College.
- 2. Describe what you know about the Global Deaf Connection program.
- 3. Tell us about the role that you have played in training the Deaf/hard of hearing teachers who participated in the Global Deaf Connection program?
- 4. What are the strengths of the Global Deaf Connection program?
- 5. What could be done differently with the program?
- 6. In your experience, what resources did Global Deaf Connection provide the teachers while they were here at MTTC? (prompt if they don't understand: interpreters, tuition, mentors)
 - a. How did these resources help the students with the coursework?
- 7. Which resources did the students not have that you think would have helped them with the coursework?
 - a. Are there any resources that GDC provided that you think could have been used differently?
- 8. In what ways do staff at MTTC help these students better succeed?
- 9. Is there anything that you think MTTC staff can do differently that would help the students better succeed?
- 10. Can you describe the interactions between the Deaf/hard of hearing students and the rest of the students at MTTC?
 - a. Can you describe a time when you felt that the Deaf/hard of hearing students were included in a student activity or in the student community?
 - b. Can you describe a time when the Deaf/hard of hearing students were excluded from a student activity or from the student community?
- 11. Think about any interactions you had with Global Deaf Connection:

- a. What kind of training did GDC provide you regarding how to work with and support Deaf/hard of hearing teachers?
 - i. **[If GDC did provide any training]:** In what ways was the training helpful?
 - ii. **[If GDC did provide any training]:** What do you wish had been different about the training?
 - iii. **[If GDC did provide any training]:** Can you talk about a time when you were able to use the training that GDC provided in your work or in your personal life?
 - iv. **[If GDC did not provide any training]:** What kind of training do you wish you had received from GDC?
 - b. How frequently did you interact or communicate with a GDC staff member? Can you describe what these interactions were typically like?
12. Have your experiences with GDC changed the way you teach or view your community?
- a. Can you describe this for me.
13. If GDC partnered with a similar teacher training college in a different country what parts of this program would you keep the same?
- a. What parts of the program would you change?
 - i. If you know, where do you think they should implement a similar program in East Africa?
14. Is there any other information about GDC or your experiences you think we should know?

Questions for teachers at MTTC

1. Tell us about your role here at Mtwara Teacher Training College.
2. Describe what you know about the Global Deaf Connection program.
3. Tell us about the role that you have played in training the Deaf/hard of hearing teachers who participated in the Global Deaf Connection program?
4. What are the strengths of the Global Deaf Connection program?
5. What could be done differently with the program?
6. In your experience, what resources did Global Deaf Connection provide the teachers while they were here at MTTC? (prompt if they don't understand: interpreters, tuition, mentors)
 - a. How did these resources help the students with the coursework?
7. Which resources did the students not have that you think would have helped them with the coursework?
 - a. Are there any resources that GDC provided that you think could have been used differently?
8. In what ways do staff at MTTC help these students better succeed?

9. Is there anything that you think MTTC staff can do differently that would help the students better succeed?
10. Can you describe the interactions between the Deaf/hard of hearing students and the rest of the students at MTTC?
 - a. Can you describe a time when you felt that the Deaf/hard of hearing students were included in a student activity or in the student community?
 - b. Can you describe a time when the Deaf/hard of hearing students were excluded from a student activity or from the student community?
11. Think about any interactions you had with Global Deaf Connection:
 - a. What kind of training did GDC provide you regarding how to work with and support Deaf/hard of hearing teachers?
 - i. **[If GDC did provide any training]:** In what ways was the training helpful?
 - ii. **[If GDC did provide any training]:** What do you wish had been different about the training?
 - iii. **[If GDC did provide any training]:** Can you talk about a time when you were able to use the training that GDC provided in your work or in your personal life?
 - iv. **[If GDC did not provide any training]:** What kind of training do you wish you had received from GDC?
 - b. How frequently did you interact or communicate with a GDC staff member? Can you describe what these interactions were typically like?
12. Have your experiences with GDC changed the way you teach or view your community?
 - a. Can you describe this for me.
13. If GDC partnered with a similar teacher training college in a different country what parts of this program would you keep the same?
 - a. What parts of the program would you change?
 - i. If you know, where do you think they should implement a similar program in East Africa?
14. Is there any other information about GDC or your experiences you think we should know?

Appendix B: Grant Proposals

Original Proposal:

Improving and Expanding Early Primary School Education for Learners with Hearing Impairments in Zanzibar and Mtwara Regions of Tanzania (2010)

Objective:

The primary objective of the proposed [sic] intervention is to create a sustainable system of quality primary education in Tanzania's Zanzibar and Mtwara Regions for all primary school children including those roughly 10,500 with hearing impairments (deaf and hard of hearing) and communication difficulties. The key component is the provision of a range of educational and material inputs that include the upgrade of teacher training for hearing and hearing impaired teachers and tutors and the provision of instructional and assistive materials including visual educational materials, hearing aids and Tanzanian Sign Language.

Strategy:

1. Baseline-survey of achievement and needs of students with hearing and communication difficulties their teachers and school management committees with continuous monitoring of achievement goals disaggregated [sic] by various interventions.
2. Preparation of a visual education program within teacher training colleges to include qualified hearing impaired students. This will entail training and mentoring local counterparts in these activities.
3. Preparation, tutoring, mentoring and provision of supports to a core of qualified hearing impaired secondary school leavers to enable them to complete the teacher training cycle in the two regions. Supports include hearing aids, sign language interpreters and visual aids in the teacher training classroom.
4. Identification of out of school and already enrolled children with hearing impaired and communication problems, and the provision of visual and communication supports including visual aids, amplification, if appropriate, with hearing aid friendly learning environments in inclusive and self-contained classrooms.
5. Preparation and promotion of basic, intermediate and advanced Tanzanian Sign Language (TSL) and Zanzibar Sign Language (ZSL) including research to be utilized for creation of instructional materials and training of trainers to impart TSL to the deaf, their families, both IE and self-contained classroom teachers in primary school I.E. and other settings and the community in general.
6. Development of TSL and ZSL interpreters through sign language and interpreter training research and courses. These interpreters will provide interpreter services to hearing impaired teachers in training.
7. Advocate, raise awareness, for implementation of international and national level policy and planning frameworks promoting education and employment for people with disabilities to sustain gains made for hearing impaired Tanzanians

8. Continual monitoring of changes in areas measured by the baseline data, semi-annual adjustments to programs and annual evaluations.

Expected Outcomes:

- At least thirty qualified hearing impaired individuals will complete the two-year teacher education course in Zanzibar and Mtwara Regions
- Approximately 200 children with hearing and communication disorders and other disadvantaged children will annually be enrolled to receive an appropriate and sustainable lower primary education from competent teachers skilled in sign language and visually instructional techniques.
- School communities and families will have measurably increased awareness and acceptance of communication disorders including hearing impairment.
- The teacher training colleges will sustain the visual and heuristic education approaches beyond the support provided by the project.
- The rates of academic progress as measured by performance on tests and progression to the next grade in selected schools where the trained teachers are placed will be higher than the control group.
- The graduates from the two teacher training colleges that receive support from this project will be more competent at visual and heuristic education compared to graduates from control teacher training colleges.
- At least 2,000 hearing impaired children will receive appropriate hearing aids and other assistive devices to aid their education.

Realigned Proposal:

Improving & Expanding Access to Primary Education for Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing Children in Tanzania (2014)

Objectives:

The primary objective of the proposed “re-alligned” [sic] intervention is to create a new model of improving and expanding access education for D/HH children in Tanzania, beginning with the Mtwara Region,

Continuation of this project will directly impact up to approximately 400 D/HH children per annum, as each of the four (Fatuma Luambano, Godfrey Mbwilo, Lightness Msuya, Dickson Rafael) D/HH MTC graduates will go forward to each teach/mentor approximately 100 D/HH children at their respective schools each year. The project will also facilitate a sensitization on simple signs and best practice inclusion of the D/HH with 10 Mtwara TTC lecturers, one TSL interpreter [sic] and two administrators. A session will also be offered per optimal collaboration with TSL interpreters. A more broad and general version of the sensitization will be offered up to as many as 20 USAID and US Embassy Tanzania personnel. *This year GDC already successfully designed and facilitated such a two-day sign language and sensitization [sic] session with 25 USAID and Embassy in Kingston, Jamaica.*

Another key project component involves the capacity building for the four D/HH students themselves to maximize their inclusive education at Mtwara TTC, their future inclusive employment at schools/units with the D/HH children while capturing these break through achievements in a success story DVD-ROM.

Each of the four D/HH Mtwara TTC graduates will sign their respective success stories, mixed with scenes from their achievements, which will be narrated in Kiswahili and captioned in English for hearing audiences. The four stories will be compiled onto a 30 minute “Deaf Tanzania Success Story” DVD-ROM, professionally designed, edited, labeled [sic] and packaged for public consumption. Up to 50 of the DVD-ROMs will be printed and utilized to promote two purposes of the project, 1) to sensitize up to 50 additional key partners and stakeholders (including 20 USAID and US Embassy Dar personnel) about the benefits of inclusion in education and employment, 2) to role model Deaf success for up to 150 D/HH children at up to 20 deaf schools/units for the Deaf. The success stories will additionally be uploaded to YouTube and other social networking platforms as appropriate to reach a wider audience.

Each of the four D/HH Mtwara TTC graduates will receive mentorship from a Deaf professional in the education sector, who will role model best practice inclusion and utilization of support services in education and employment. The mentorship sessions will take place with the D/HH students at MTC and also at their teacher placement schools/units [sic]. The Deaf mentor will be accompanied by a Deaf Education professor to share best practice inclusion of the recently placed D/HH teacher.

Strategy:

USAID/Tanzania funded support activities:

1. Mentor TSL interpreter at Mtwara TTC per best practices from the interpretation sector and strategies to collaborate with D/HH students, along with hearing colleagues at the college.
2. Mentor D/HH students in best practice methods to work with the TSL interpreter, and to include themselves at Mtwara TTC and at their future place of work.
3. Support the Mtwara TTC graduates who are already placed at schools/units with a mentorship visit from a seasoned Deaf teacher and Deaf Education professor from US. The Deaf mentor and Deaf Education professor will share inclusive education practices and experiences with the D/HH teacher and also school administration to ensure a smooth and successful piloted placement.

Leveraged in kind contribution support activities:

1. Introduce USAID and US Embassy Dar personnel to simple signs and inclusive concepts, field questions about disability and development in Tanzania and worldwide.
2. Source and vet technical team (video editor, voice narrator, etc) to produce “TZ Deaf Teacher Success Stories” DVD-ROMs from the 4 D/HH Mtwara TTC graduates for key partners, stakeholders and schools/units for the Deaf.

3. Confirm technical team for “Deaf success stories” DVD-ROM, identify terms of reference and frame work agreement for assignment.
4. Outline, script and rehearse [sic] success stories with the 4 D/HH MTC graduates.
5. Film final draft, five minute success stores from each of the 4 D/HH Mtwara TTC graduates
6. Capture scenes from the four D/HH students at MTC and/or in their job placement. Also film interviews from supporting partners/stakeholders (ie, Mtwara TTC principal, TSL interpreter, etc).
7. Edit down first draft of “Deaf success skills” DVD-ROM, review and suggest revision.
8. Produce and distribute final draft “Deaf Success Skils” [sic] DVD-ROM, publishing 50 copies on DVD-ROM for distribution to project’s key partners/stakeholders and up to 20 schools/units for the Deaf.
9. Conduct external evaluation with 5-person evaluation team team from University of Minnesota. Organize and execute logistics, inclusive of identifying interviewees and interpreters (Kiswahili and TSL).